

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.
20052

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD
ON SEPTEMBER 18, 1981, IN
LISNER HALL-ROOM 603

1 The meeting was called to order at 2:25 p.m., by Provost Bright.

Present: Provost Bright, Registrar Gebhardtshauer, Parliamentarian Cheh, Birnbaum, Claeysens, Divita, Eldridge, Elgart, Fox, Frey, Griffith, Hill, Kelly, Liebowitz, Mazzeo, Morgan, Packer, Pierpont, Robinson, Sachlis, Schiff, B. Smith, L. Solomon, Toridis, Wallace, and Ziolkowski

Absent: President Elliott, Barron, Burns, Chandler, Hawkins, Linton, Loeser, Sapin, H. Solomon, G. Smith, Steiner, and Zenoff

Professor Divita, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, offered the following tribute in memory of Professor Walton E. Smith:

On behalf of the faculty of the School of Government and Business Administration, I ask that we pause for a moment to honor the memory of our colleague, Professor Walton E. Smith, who died this summer as a result of an untimely auto accident. Wally joined our faculty in 1968 in the area of Information Systems while completing his Doctorate of Science in our School of Engineering and Applied Science.

Wally was an active member of our community. He served on numerous school and university committees and was a member of the Senate 1973-75. He was a committed teacher who took a personal interest in his students. He was a pilot, sportsman, scholar, university trustee, public speaker, consultant and a colleague. He enjoyed life and lived it to the fullest.

Those of us who knew him are saddened by his untimely death. In his memory, the faculty of SGBA voted unanimously at its August meeting to name the SGBA computer center the Walton E. Smith Computer Center, a small tribute to a great human being.

(The Senate rose for a moment of silent tribute.)

2 The minutes of the regular meeting of May 1, 1981, were approved as distributed.

3 Professor Hill, on behalf of the Executive Committee, moved adoption of Resolution 81/4, "A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Code with Respect to Criteria for Tenure," and the motion was seconded. Professor Hill explained that the Faculty Code stipulates criteria for promotion but not for the granting of tenure. The Executive Committee saw an urgency to correct this omission and polled the Senate by mail ballot in July on the question of whether or not it would concur in an amendment to Article IV.B. to add the phrase "and the granting of tenure" where the word "promotion" appeared. If approved, the Executive Committee intended to take this amendment before the Faculty Assembly in early September. The amendment was overwhelmingly approved; however, Professor Hill said that several administrative officers had voiced some concern about the form of this amendment and the Executive Committee agreed to bring it before the Senate for further consideration at today's meeting.

Professor Elgart moved that the resolution be amended to substitute the word "or" for the word "and" in the phrase "and the granting of tenure," because he said that the Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure in the Department of Medicine thought there was a difference between promotion and the granting of tenure. Provost Bright asked Professor Elgart if he would withdraw his motion temporarily so that a full discussion could be held before motions were made. Professor Elgart withdrew his motion. Professor Sachlis pointed out that there should be a University-wide policy on the general criteria for the granting of tenure with the schools and colleges deciding on the weights or additional factors. A discussion followed by Professor Griffith, Dean Birnbaum, and Professor Morgan.

The Provost relinquished the Chair to Professor Pierpont so that he could speak to the resolution. Dr. Bright said that it seemed to him the problem arose from including promotion and tenure in the same section of the Code because he thought the two things were different. A faculty member may be approved for promotion because he or she is very good in a particular area, but when it comes time to make a tenure decision, Dr. Bright thought that the department and school ought to look at programmatic considerations, i.e., whether or not this person's central area was one that would be important in the next ten or fifteen years. He thought it would be unlikely that a department would look at the total programmatic considerations in the same way as the administration would. He said he was not implying that the central administration would have anything to do with deciding anything about one's professional status, which has to be decided by the faculty member's colleagues, but he stressed that the total program of the University must be considered. He also thought that total programmatic considerations of the University, carefully studied, would constitute compelling reasons for non-concurrence. Professor Morgan inquired whether there would be less compelling grounds for non-concurrence if the criteria for granting tenure were specified and if, in fact, the appointment to tenure-track had been made very reasonably with the approval of the administration. Dr. Bright replied that appointment to tenure-track did not necessarily imply appointment to tenure. Professor Morgan responded that, nevertheless, the approval of a tenure-track appointment did imply a judgment on the part of the relevant administrators as to the programmatic need for such appointment.

In raising the question of "programmatic considerations," Professor Wallace said that three different levels must be considered - the department, the college, and the University - and she recommended that these levels be clarified because one level may not be in concurrence with the programmatic decision of another level. Professor Hill said it seemed to him that what the Provost suggested would shift the right to change one's mind from the faculty to the administration in that the administration may approve a tenure-track appointment and then change its mind about the programmatic value of that tenure-slot, and he thought the Senate ought to consider whether that was desirable. Further discussion followed by Provost Bright, Professors Morgan, Griffith, Robinson, Hill, and Smith. Professor Hill said that he thought the criteria set forth in the Code for promotion were equally applicable for the granting of tenure and the only question raised by the administration was whether there should be additional criteria for the granting of tenure and, if so, whether there should be a separate clause in the Code separating the two. Professor Morgan said that in the absence of stated criteria for making a recommendation for tenure, other language in the Code bearing on the matter made it extremely difficult to justify a negative tenure decision, if, in fact, a positive promotion decision was made. He pointed out that the "and/or's" in this resolution were very carefully inserted to assure that criteria for tenure and for promotion could be distinguished. Professor Griffith pointed out that another matter for consideration was the resolution passed by the Senate and just recently by the Faculty Assembly requiring the schools and departments to set up committees to make recommendations on the allocation of tenure positions in the various units. Though not yet approved by the Board, he suggested that these tenure matters could become very complicated, not only with having an administrative overview about programmatic consideration, but presumably with recommendations by faculty committees in the different schools and colleges.

Professor Pierpont then recognized the Parliamentarian. Professor Cheh said she wished to comment on the resolution before the Senate because of her recent involvement in a major grievance proceeding which bore on the proposed amendment to the Code. While not speaking as an advocate for or against the amendment, she said the Senate should consider what particular evil it was trying to address by adding the proposed Code language--if it was to minimize grievance proceedings or to make them more resolvable, she suspected that the very opposite would be true. Under the current system the decision on tenure was one that could be made for any reason or even for no reason, as long as it was not an unconstitutional or discriminatory reason. She said that if the same criteria had been applicable in the case that she litigated, the University could not have prevented the granting of tenure in the continuation of employment of that particular individual even though it was plain that on matters of collegiality, commitment to the University, and other criteria, that individual was unacceptable to the department and to the University. She also pointed out that departmental conditions varied, and considerations of collegiality and commitment may be very relevant to small departments and those kind of criteria would be eliminated by the proposed amendment. Professor Cheh said she offered her comments merely as a participant in a recent grievance proceeding as she thought the Senate should have some view of what the real ramifications of this resolution might be.

Professor Eldridge moved that the resolution be remanded to the committee since it seemed apparent to him that very careful consideration of the phraseology

was required. [The Provost resumed the Chair.] Professor Morgan moved that the matter be referred to the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom and the Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies; the motion was seconded. Professor Fox suggested that the motion be amended to remand the resolution to the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom with instructions to consult with the Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies. Professor Morgan and the seconder accepted the amendment. The question was called and the motion to remand was adopted unanimously. (Resolution 81/4 attached; a letter dated September 18, 1981, to Senate members from Professor David Robinson, Jr., pertaining to Resolution 81/4 was distributed and referred to the above-stated committees.)

4 No resolutions were introduced under Introduction of Resolutions.

5 (a) Professor Hill, on behalf of the Executive Committee, nominated Professor Lois G. Schwoerer and Professor Charles A. Moser for election to the Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty. The nominees were elected unanimously.

(b) Professor Hill, on behalf of the Executive Committee, nominated Professor Richard H. Schlagel and Mr. Cliff Smith, student, for election to the Committee on Public Ceremonies. Professor Claeysens nominated Ms. Claudia J. Derricotte, Director of Student Activities, for election to the Public Ceremonies Committee also. The nominees were elected unanimously.

Professor Hill, on behalf of the Executive Committee, nominated Professor Salvatore F. Divita for election to the Grievance Committee as a replacement for Professor Frederick C. Kurtz, who resigned. Professor Divita was elected unanimously.

(c) Professor Hill, in his report to the Senate, said he wished first of all to extend the thanks of the Executive Committee to Professor Claeysens and Mr. Boris Bell for their efforts in organizing and carrying out the first Fall Convocation which appeared to be well-received. During the summer, he said the Executive Committee, in conjunction with the Administrative Matters Committee, had recommended certain changes in the format of the Annual Report Forms. With the cooperation of the Provost's Office and particularly with the knowledgeable suggestions and guidance of Mrs. Trexler, certain changes were made. In another enterprise the Executive Committee undertook preliminary efforts to rectify the late-grade situation. Department chairmen were notified of the names of their colleagues whose grades had missed the deadlines and various proposals have been offered to correct this situation. In the meantime, he said that the Registrar and the Administrative Matters Committee have been asked to continue to work on this problem. At the Faculty Assembly last week, Professor Hill noted that the resolution requiring establishment of elected standing committees or committees of the whole in the schools and colleges to recommend tenure-slot allocations had been approved unanimously, and needed only the Board's approval at this point. He then reported on the many assignments being worked on by the Senate Standing Committees, noting that the Senate has a full year ahead of it.

(d) There were no interim reports from Senate Standing Committees.

6

Under Brief Statements, Professor Schiff said he wished to voice his concern about the number of class cancellations which occur after registration. He cited an example of a doctoral student who signed up for a required course, only to find that it has been cancelled after registration. The student then signed up for another required course and that, too, was cancelled after registration. Thereupon, she registered for a third course and discovered that the professor had decided on his own to change the class time which conflicted with one of her other courses. Professor Schiff said that perhaps this was an isolated incident, but it had happened to three students, and he didn't think it was any way to run a railroad, much less a university.

Professor Griffith, speaking as Chairman of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee, commented that he thought the time was approaching when the Senate ought to develop a threshold that after it refers so many items to a committee, a course reduction was in order. He noted that some chairmen were spending a lot of time drafting and re-drafting recommendations which, in a very real sense, could be considered legal work for the University.

7

Upon motion made and seconded, Provost Bright adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.



Robert Gebhardtsbauer
Secretary

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE WITH RESPECT TO CRITERIA FOR TENURE (81/4)

WHEREAS, Article IV.B. of the Faculty Code establishes certain criteria on which promotion shall be dependent, requires each school to establish criteria on which promotion shall be based, and requires each department to establish procedures for making decisions concerning promotion; and

WHEREAS, good policy suggests (a) that the Code should include comparable criteria and reference to procedures for the granting of tenure, and (b) that faculty members for whom it is appropriate be informed annually of the progress they are making toward promotion and/or tenure; therefore:

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That Article IV.B. of the Faculty Code be amended as follows:

- (1) by adding "and the Granting of Tenure" after the word "Promotion" in the title of Section B;
- (2) by adding "and/or the granting of tenure" after the word "Promotion" in line 1 of paragraph 1;
- (3) by adding "or the granting of tenure" after the word "promotion" in line 3 of paragraph 3;
- (4) by adding "and the granting of tenure" after the word "promotions" at the end of the last line in paragraph 3;
- (5) by substituting "annually" for the word "periodically" in the 2nd line of paragraph 4;
- (6) by adding "and/or tenure" after the word "promotion" in the last line of paragraph 4.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
July 1, 1981

Preferred, September 18, 1981, to the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom with instructions to consult with the Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.
20052

The Faculty Senate

September 2, 1981

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, September 18, 1981, at 2:10 p.m., in the Faculty Conference Room, Sixth Floor, Lisner Hall.

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Minutes of the regular meeting of May 1, 1981
3. Resolutions:

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE WITH RESPECT TO CRITERIA FOR TENURE (81/4); Professor Peter P. Hill, Chairman, Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate (resolution attached)

4. Introduction of Resolutions
5. General Business:
 - (a) Nomination for election of Professor Lois G. Schwoerer (History) and Professor Charles A. Moser (Slavic Languages) to the Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty
 - (b) Nomination for election of Professor Richard H. Schlagel (Philosophy) and Mr. Cliff Smith (student) to the Committee on Public Ceremonies
 - (c) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Peter P. Hill, Chairman
 - (d) Interim Reports of Senate Standing Committees
6. Brief Statements
7. Adjournment



Robert Gebhardtshauer
Secretary

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE WITH RESPECT TO CRITERIA FOR TENURE (81/4)

WHEREAS, Article IV.B. of the Faculty Code establishes certain criteria on which promotion shall be dependent, requires each school to establish criteria on which promotion shall be based, and requires each department to establish procedures for making decisions concerning promotion; and

WHEREAS, good policy suggests (a) that the Code should include comparable criteria and reference to procedures for the granting of tenure, and (b) that faculty members for whom it is appropriate be informed annually of the progress they are making toward promotion and/or tenure; therefore:

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That Article IV.B. of the Faculty Code be amended as follows:

- (1) by adding "and the Granting of Tenure" after the word "Promotion" in the title of Section B;
- (2) by adding "and/or the granting of tenure" after the word "Promotion" in line 1 of paragraph 1;
- (3) by adding "or the granting of tenure" after the word "promotion" in line 3 of paragraph 3;
- (4) by adding "and the granting of tenure" after the word "promotions" at the end of the last line in paragraph 3;
- (5) by substituting "annually" for the word "periodically" in the 2nd line of paragraph 4;
- (6) by adding "and/or tenure" after the word "promotion" in the last line of paragraph 4.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
July 1, 1981